

a larger population than the Boran-kanve area. Is it not therefore worth while restoring the Ankasandra tank?

Mr. N. N. AYYANGAR.—We shall investigate if a smaller tank at the place could be constructed.

Mr. Mummadi H. C. VEERABHA. DRAPPA.—With reference to answer to (d) and (e), when was the estimate for the Ankasandra project prepared?

Mr. N. N. AYYANGAR.—No detailed plans and estimates have been prepared as yet.

Allegations against the Amildar of Hunsur Taluk.

Q.—19. Mr. H. M. CHANNABASAPPA (Hunsur Taluk).—

Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(a) (i) whether there have been any complaints from the raiyats against the Amildar, Hunsur Taluk, regarding his conduct, or relating to any other matter; (ii) if so, how many; (iii) and when they were made;

(b) whether any enquiries have been instituted in respect of these complaints; if so, in respect of which complaints have enquiries been held; the result of such enquiries; who conducted the enquiry;

(c) the number of days after the receipt of such complaints the enquiry was instituted; the reason for the delay?

A.—The CHIEF SECRETARY to GOVERNMENT (Mr. B. T. Kesava-Iengar).—

(a) (i) Yes.

(ii) Three.

(iii) 1. 15-11-1937.

2. 28-11-1937.

3. 29-11-1937.

(b) Yes. In respect of complaint petitions dated the 15th November 1937 and 28th November 1937.

The complaints were not proved.

The Sub-Division Officer, Mysore.

(c) The enquiry was started on 18th April 1938. The enquiry could not be started earlier owing to the failure of parties to appear and hesitation on their part to give their statement.

Need for a Munsiff-Magistrate's Court at Hunsur.

Q.—21. Messrs. Gurukar. NANJAPPA (Gundlupet Taluk); SIDDAPPA (Nanjand Taluk); S. C. MALLIAH (Maddur Taluk); H. K. MADIAH (Malvalli Taluk) and J. DEVAIYA (Mandya Taluk).—

Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(a) the number of civil suits filed in the Munsiff's Court at Hunsur pertaining to the taluks of Krishnarajanagara, Hunsur and the Periyapatna Sub-Taluk; the income derived (particulars of income per annum and the number of cases for the last three years may kindly be furnished talukwar);

(b) whether the cases of Heggaddevankote Taluk were not again transferred to Mysore on the ground that it was inconvenient for the people of Heggaddevankote to go to Hunsur;

(c) whether the people of Krishnarajanagara have not been often praying for establishing a Munsiff-Magistrate's Court in Krishnarajanagara?

A.—The CHIEF SECRETARY to GOVERNMENT (Mr. B. T. Kesava-Iengar).—

(a) Please see statement appended. (Appendix).

(b) Yes.

(c) Yes.

Lokasevaniratha Bale SIDDALINGA SETTY.—With reference to answer (b), why was jurisdiction over civil suits from Heggaddevankote again transferred to the Mysore Court?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—In the interests of the convenience of both the Government and the litigant public.

Mr. Bale SIDDALINGA SETTY.—With reference to answer (c), why has the prayer of the people of Krishnarajanagara not been granted yet?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—Because it would mean a heavy expenditure with no adequate return.

Mr. Bale SIDDALINGA SETTY.—Even so, is it not the duty of Government to provide for the necessary conveniences to all their subjects?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—Yes, to the extent possible, and consistent with financial justification. Moreover, it is

W.S?
B 4690

a question which cannot be disposed of without consulting the High Court.

Mr. Bale SIDDALINGA SETTY.—Are Government aware that the late Chief Justice Mr. C. S. Doraswami Iyer visited Krishnarajanagara, examined the question and recommended the construction of the necessary buildings at the place for the location of the court as well as for officials' quarters?

The FIRST MEMBER (Rajamantrapravina S. P. Rajagopalachari).—That might have been the case once. But now the High Court have reconsidered the question and stated that just at present there is no necessity for a separate Court at the place.

Mr. Bale SIDDALINGA SETTY.—What was the opinion furnished by Mr. P. Mahadevayya as Chief Justice on this subject?

Mr. S. P. RAJAGOPALACHARI.—I cannot state the opinions of individual judges. All I can say is that a separate court for Krishnarajanagara is not considered necessary at present.

Mr. Bale SIDDALINGA SETTY.—But the High Court have not said so.

Mr. S. P. RAJAGOPALACHARI.—I am merely stating the opinion of the High Court.

Mr. Bale SIDDALINGA SETTY.—Do not the figures relating to suits instituted within the past 3 years justify the establishment of a separate court?

Mr. S. P. RAJAGOPALACHARI.—As stated already, this is essentially a matter in which the Government have to go by the opinion of the High Court. We cannot give an additional court to each and every taluk. A fair distribution of jurisdiction has to be effected among the existing courts on the basis of area, distance from the different places, etc. And if the existing arrangement has given room for any grievance, the member may make another representation to the High Court.

Mr. Bale SIDDALINGA SETTY.—What we are pressing for is a Munsiff-Magistrate's court. There will be plenty of income on both civil and criminal sides. We therefore pray that the matter be kindly reconsidered from the points of view of the number of suits,

the anticipated revenue, and such other recognised data.

Mr. S. P. RAJAGOPALACHARI.—I have stated that for the present the High Court is not in favour of the proposal. They may however take up the question some time hence.

Mr. TIPPU SULTAN ALI KHAN.—Are the Government aware that the more the number of courts, the greater will be the impoverishment of the people?

Mr. S. P. RAJAGOPALACHARI.—Yes, that is also a possible view.

REPRESENTATIONS—contd.

No. 21.—Reduction of wet assessment in malnad parts.

Mr. B. N. BORANNA GOWDA (Belūr Taluk) and all the other members of Hassan District.

Mr. B. N. BORANNA GOWDA represented that the rate of wet assessment in malnad parts of the State was very high, ranging from Rs. 2 to Rs. 8 per acre. There were only a few tanks in the malnad and the availability of agricultural labour was scanty. Added to these handicaps, the damage caused to crops by wild animals was considerable. In spite of all this, remission was not being granted in the malnad as a general rule. He therefore prayed that the wet rates might be reduced so as not to exceed Rs. 4 per acre.

Mr. H. M. CHANNABASAPPA, in supporting the above view, remarked that in olden times, the atchkats under the several tanks were fixed on the presumption that the tanks would fill not once or twice during a year, but even 3 or 4 times. But actually, however, most of the tanks were not filling even once at present. So that the landholders were experiencing a lot of difficulty in paying the land revenue. And the position was definitely worse in cases where rainfall was scanty. But it was usual for village officers to make in the *pahani* accounts entries to indicate full crops even in such cases. For all these reasons he said that no remissions were being granted. This was particularly the case with the malnad where, unlike the maidan, paucity of labour as well as manure was